DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 934 HE 025 995

TITLE Education by Chance or by Choice: Challenges and Options Facing Colorado Postsecondary Education as It Prepares To Enter the Twenty-First Century. Colorado Commission on Higher Education Master Plan Background Paper.

INSTITUTION Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Denver.

PUB DATE [92]

NOTE 16p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Educational Finance; Educational Trends; *Enrollment Trends; Financial Problems; Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Long Range Planning; State Aid; *State Colleges; *State Universities

IDENTIFIERS *Colorado

ABSTRACT

This paper looks at current trends in higher education nationally and in Colorado. It offers projections for the future to assist the development of possible strategies and directions for higher education in the early 21st Century. Opening sections look at higher education broadly noting the Colorado vision statement for postsecondary education, the current public crisis of confidence in higher education, the slow economy, projected increasing demands on the higher education system, and changes in labor market expectations. A central section argues that Colorado citizens' desires for higher education will increase significantly by the turn of the century but that the state is not in a good position to meet the financial obligation involved in such an increased demand. The paper argues that, in order to sustain the state's vitality, the state must consider ways to provide for increased needs within the given financial constraints and that decision-makers will be forced to decide among competing values. The balance of the paper discusses six possible strategies for solving this dilemma: (1) sustain public funding for increased postsecondary education demand; (2) prioritize access to postsecondary education; (3) constrain convenience to postsecondary education; (4) allow the quality of postsecondary education to decline; (5) improve the productivity of postsecondary education; and (6) consider new ways of subsidizing postsecondary education. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION MASTER PLAN BACKGROUND PAPER:

ED351934

Education by Chance or by Choice:

Challenges and Options Facing Colorado Postsecondary Education as it Prepares to Enter the Twenty-first Century

HE 025 995

Colorado Commission on Higher Education
1300 Broadway, Second Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
(303) 866-2723
David A. Longanecker, Executive Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CO Comm on H.E.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Education by Choice or by Chance:
Challenges and Options Facing Colorado Postsecondary Education
as it Prepares to Enter the Twenty-first Century

WHAT WE KNOW TODAY

Although it is true that "if you don't know where you're going, any road will do", it is equally true that "if you don't know where you are, it's difficult to get to where you want to be". These pieces of folk wisdom are reminders that in successful organizational planning, both a vision for the future and an accurate understanding of the present are essential prerequisites.

The members of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education have established the following vision statement for Colorado postsecondary education:

> *Colorado public higher education is built on the understanding that both the individual and society benefit from the educational enterprise. As a result, every resident should have reasonable opportunity to pursue the education and training that best meets his/her needs and potential. This education and training should provide the student with the skills, knowledge and dispositions that adult citizens need to be employed productively and engaged actively in civic life. Institutions that provide the education and training should be able and willing to demonstrate that they provide the education and training needed by those they serve. These services should be provided as effectively and efficiently as possible. The state must ensure that its institutions have sufficient funds from public and private sources to provide quality education and training. In order for society and the individual to benefit, the individual participant must put forth an effort commensurate with the opportunity that has been provided.*

In planning for Colorado's postsecondary education system in the twenty-first century, considerable information is available about the current educational landscape and what is likely to be the case in the near future. This information has been accumulated as a result of the work of the Colorado Commission on Higher Education in recent years and, more specifically, as part of the policy analyses conducted in preparation for the Colorado postsecondary education master plan. To cite only a few examples, much is known about the current status of public confidence in higher education, about productivity, about demands for educational services in the near future, and about likely levels of public funding. What is known about these and other areas affecting postsecondary education will be essential tools in shaping Colorado's future.

Throughout the nation public confidence in our colleges and universities has eroded. Although Colorado has suffered less than other states, the phenomenon exists and must be

honestly acknowledged. There are various reasons for this development, but among the more noteworthy are:

- ***The belief that faculty in some sectors of higher education are no longer primarily interested in teaching (especially at the undergraduate level), and have as a consequence retreated from the classroom in order to devote more time to research and publication.***

- ***The perception that the size of administrative staffs at colleges and universities has grown unnecessarily large. Some would link this growth to the shift in faculty priorities from teaching to research, arguing that additional administrators were necessary to provide students with services (academic advising, career counseling, extracurricular activities, etc.) provided by faculty in an earlier time.***

- ***Increases throughout the 1980s in the price of higher education (tuition and fees) accompanied by increasing dependence on loans (rather than grants) as a component of the financial aid packages which underwrite college costs. The result is the perception that the student is receiving less while paying more.***

WHAT WE SEE FOR THE FUTURE

Because of the sluggish national and state economies, and because of competing claims on limited resources by numerous service groups, it appears that the State of Colorado is unlikely to provide significantly greater financial resources to higher education. Indeed, there is the possibility of a reduction in real dollar flow, should some version of a spending limitation amendment be passed by the electorate.

In response to an erosion of public confidence and restricted financial resources, individual colleges and universities as well as the state system, as a whole may turn to an exercise that has been a common feature of corporate and business life for years: strategic planning. In a period of rising educational costs and fewer resources, both institutions and CCHE will find it imperative to use decision making procedures which will identify those programs, activities, and personnel central to their missions; those which are on the margins; and how best to allocate finite resources across the spectrum. This is what strategic planning, at its best, is all about.

Once the increasing role that strategic planning will play is added to eroding public confidence and restricted resources, there will undoubtedly be increasing calls for accountability and assessment from both policy makers and the public at large — calls for accountability of administrators and faculties in their use of limited resources, and in their implementation of strategic planning decisions and assessment in the demand for reports on student learning.

Demographic data and reasonable projections about those skills required in the workplace by the year 2000 and beyond conclude that the demand for educational services will increase dramatically in the near future. Because of an increase in the college-age population, the public and private sectors of postsecondary education will need to enroll and serve at least an additional 22 percent of students (at an additional expense of $80 to $100 million) over the next decade, just to maintain today's participation rate. An additional 10 percent increase in enrollment will be called for if Colorado is to have a technically skilled work force in place at the turn of the century. With a shift from a manufacturing based economy to one defined by information/service industries, tomorrow's work force will need more of the higher order cognitive skills that higher education develops. Finally, the demand for lifelong learning and continuing education will likely increase. This demand will come from two groups: those who need to be retrained to fit the needs of the new economy and the increasing numbers of citizens who simply want to keep their minds active.

Therefore, the demands that will be made of our colleges and universities are likely to increase by 35 to 50 percent over the next decade.

Although an increase of this magnitude is reasonable to project, what is less certain is where within that range the actual demand will fall. Furthermore, there are important uncertain variables that must be kept in mind.

How much of the increased demand, for example, can be absorbed by the private sector of higher education? The additional 22 percent of students which will have to be accommodated over the next decade is projected on the basis of an assumption that the private sector will sustain, not increase, its current share of in-state students. It is possible that their share will increase, but a change in their historic missions would have to occur for this to happen. It is unlikely that new independent colleges and universities will be established as the college-age population increases. Second, will most of the increased demand be at the sub-baccalaureate level, the baccalaureate level, or evenly divided? Complicating attempts to answer this question is the possibility that, because of increasing numbers of high school graduates, the demand from students may point in one direction (baccalaureate), while the needs of the workplace may point in a different direction (sub-baccalaureate). And finally, will the historic pattern of in-migration of highly educated and skilled persons to Colorado continue, or will Colorado have to educate more of its own? Complicating this issue is, of course, the further question: shouldn't Colorado aim to provide postsecondary educational experiences for increasing numbers of native population even if in-migration patterns continue?

After allowing for all these uncertainties, however, the fact remains that over the next decade a significantly larger number of Colorado citizens, particularly those who have been underserved, will be looking to postsecondary education to meet their needs and respond to their desires.

Also apparent is the fact that an increased percentage of the new entrants into the labor force and of the 17 to 21-year-old population (the traditional college-age group) will be members of underrepresented ethnic minority groups. Almost one-third of workers and roughly 25 percent of traditional college age youth will be minorities.

This latter development is notable because, despite impressive progress that has been made in recent years, ethnic minorities are still not well served by our educational system. In disproportionally large numbers they do not graduate from high school; and even though a larger percentage of those who do graduate now enroll in our colleges and universities, disproportionally large numbers do not meet their educational goals. Persistence in and completion of degree programs remain a challenge. In addition to a moral imperative to do a better job in educating ethnic minorities, there is the compelling case of simple, state self-interest.

With regard to productivity, the Colorado postsecondary system as a whole is more efficient than most states. With total funding from tuition and general fund support ranking 45th nationally (16 percent below the national average) Colorado receives comparatively more for its investment than nearly every other state. Administrative costs for Colorado higher education also lag behind national rates. Furthermore, within recent years many new students have been directed to lower cost community colleges.

In spite of these marks of productivity, critics argue that the entire higher education establishment is inefficient, so being among the best may not be sufficient evidence of high productivity. Others argue that the state's existing diffused governance structure is not designed to achieve maximum productivity. Still others contend that until a higher percentage of students achieve their educational goals, and do so within a more reasonable time frame, claims about improved productivity should be discounted.

The critics, and their charges, must be taken seriously. In the process of doing so, some hard questions about the meaning of productivity need to be raised. For example, is the society inclined to incorporate a "consumer driven" model, rather than a "standards based" model, in which the academic community establishes appropriate educational outcomes?

Also, are current degree completion rates and time frames satisfactory? The historical record is clear: for the most part only about half of the students who began a course of study in colleges and universities completed their programs. That remains true today. Achieving greater productivity in degree completion will, therefore, require new strategies and experimentation, not a return to the good old days.

The same applies to allegations about why students take as long as they do to complete their courses of studies. Do students delay getting their degrees because they receive inadequate advising or cannot enroll in classes because courses are simply not available? Or are delays

caused by changes in one's major in the junior or senior years, or a decision simply to stop-out for a period of time?

A great deal about where Colorado postsecondary education is today and what the trends will be for the next decade. This information is instructive about what needs to be done in the future to serve the goal of sustaining, indeed, improving access, quality, productivity, and accountability at our colleges and universities. But where does this knowledge leave the State of Colorado in terms of options for the future? This is the critical question.

THE DILEMMA FACING COLORADO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Looking to the future, it is clear that Colorado's appetite for higher education enrollment will grow significantly as we enter the next century. This demand will be primarily fed by ever-increasing numbers of college-age Coloradans. In addition, changing workforce needs of employers and increased interest in lifelong learning will increase demand.

Also quite certain is the reality that the State of Colorado is not well positioned to provide the financial postsecondary education nourishment necessary to satisfy all Coloradans. In order to sustain our state's vitality then, the state and its citizens must consider ways to provide for these increased needs, given likely financial constraints. The choices are not easy; the challenges are great.

In every case, decision-makers will be forced to decide among competing values. Leaders of this state have a choice. They could deliberately plan for the future and face the challenges addressing the state's postsecondary education system. Or they could give in to the temptation to assume a business-as-usual approach. Simply assuming that the state's colleges and universities will continue to absorb new students as they have in the past, and deliver high quality instruction will not work. For years, Colorado colleges have made room for additional students. Today, colleges serve increasing numbers of students who filled vacant seats, but brought with them tuition checks that only covered a portion of full educational costs. As a result, most colleges can not afford to "do it all", and are beginning to make changes that slowly, but surely, reduce the quality, access, and/or effectiveness of instruction. Most often these changes, are subtle, silent, and nearly unnoticeable to students and casual observers. Those in a position to know, however, see the toll of these well meant intentions. Institutions have decreased contact hours taught by full-time faculty, and have delayed needed academic building maintenance and construction. If the state's leaders do not act decisively, accepting the consequences of their choices, the alternative is clear: fate or chance could lead our postsecondary system into the twenty-first century.

OPTIONS FOR ADDRESSING THE DILEMMA

The state postsecondary system is at a crossroads facing six apparent sets of choices. These choices include:

1. **Sustain public funding for increased postsecondary education demand.**
2. **Prioritize access to postsecondary education.**
3. **Constrain convenience to postsecondary education.**
4. **Allow the quality of postsecondary education to decline.**
5. **Improve productivity of postsecondary education.**
6. **Consider new ways of subsidizing postsecondary education.**

Each of these choices is discussed in detail in the following sections.

1. SUSTAIN PUBLIC FUNDING FOR INCREASED POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION DEMAND.

One alternative for addressing the dilemma facing the state's postsecondary education system would be to increase state funding above the rate of inflation to accommodate growth. Between now and the year 2001, increased high school graduation, workforce needs, and life-long learning are estimated to increase postsecondary enrollment by 22% to 50%.

Increasing numbers of high school graduates alone (at current college participation rates) will increase postsecondary enrollment by 22%. Assuming that traditional attendance patterns continue, recent high school graduates will most likely attend four-year colleges and universities. The estimated cost for this enrollment increase is $100 million for instruction, and $136 million for new facilities. When increased workforce needs are included, the projected enrollment increase swells to 33%. This level of increased demand would cost an additional $145 million for instruction, and $225 million for new facilities. In addition, if the college-going rate continues to outpace population growth as it has in the past, total enrollment growth could reach 50%, requiring increases of nearly $200 million for instruction and $325 million in new facilities. The $325 estimated facility cost is based upon operating costs of current campus facilities. Facility costs could be reduced by

building a new campus that operates at a lower cost, or by extending the use of telecommunication and other educational technologies.

Estimated Cost in Dollars[1]: $100-$200 million (instruction)[2]
$136-$325 million (facilities)

2. PRIORITIZE ACCESS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.

Another alternative for addressing the state's postsecondary education dilemma would be to prioritize access to a postsecondary education. Access (essentially whether or not a student can attend college) could be prioritized in a variety of ways, depending on the values of the state.

A) Limit Enrollment to a Specified Number of Students Regardless of Academic Preparation.

One strategy to reprioritize access would be to limit enrollment, without regard to student academic ability, between now and the year 2001 to the current level of approximately 166,000 resident students. This strategy could be accomplished in one of two essentially random ways. One would be to establish a virtual lottery system in which all students, regardless of academic background, are given equal chance on a predetermined admission date. Another option would be to admit students on a first come, first-served basis. This option would undoubtedly discriminate against nontraditional and other students who, for a variety of reasons, would not apply by the admission date.

B) Limit Enrollment by Increasing Academic Requirements.

Another strategy to limit enrollment would be to increase academic requirements for Colorado colleges overall, thereby eliminating access for some Coloradans. For example, a minimum required ACT/SAT test score, or high school grade point average, could be established for admission. Regardless of the level of minimum academic requirements established for admission to Colorado colleges, the consequences of this approach would fall disproportionately upon educationally disadvantaged students.

---

[1]The quantification of alternatives for reducing costs and increasing revenues that are contained in this paper are presented for discussion purposes only. More extensive refinement of these estimates will be conducted as strategies are selected for inclusion in the Master Plan.

[2]Estimates are based upon the "All Things Remaining the Same" assumptions contained in Projection of Demand for Colorado Higher Education, FY 1993-FY 2002, CCHE, August 7, 1992, and CCHE Master Plan Issue Papers #1 and #2.

Enrollment "caps" would not just limit future access to current levels. Given projected increases of over 22% by the year 2001, (at today's college participation rate), caps of any form would actually reduce access. While the consequences of enrollment limits would depend upon the specific features of the limits, the impact would almost certainly fall disproportionately upon educationally disadvantaged students and life-long learners. In addition, traditional-age college students unable to attend college in Colorado would most likely attend colleges in other states, at considerably higher tuition. The State of Colorado could also incur financial and social costs if a significant proportion of 18 to 22 year-olds left the state. Enrollment caps, regardless of form, would unfairly give some Coloradans a direct postsecondary education benefit from their tax dollar, while others would receive none.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs:
$236 million (by the year 2001)[3]

C) Limit Enrollment by Eliminating Funding for Remedial Instruction.

An additional strategy to limit enrollment would be to eliminate state funding for remedial instruction. While some would argue that by funding public school instruction and remedial instruction, the state "pays twice", such a strategy would certainly impact educationally disadvantaged students disproportionately.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs:
$10 million (per year)[4]

3. CONSTRAIN CONVENIENCE TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.

An alternative closely parallel to the access alternative is to constrain convenience to postsecondary education. While access is *whether or not* an individual can attend college, convenience means *how easily* they can attend. Access represents the state's commitment to *make it possible* for all citizens who can benefit to receive a good postsecondary education. Convenience is the state's commitment to *make it easy* for some citizens. Convenience, in this sense, does not refer to practical conveniences such as ample parking and desire course scheduling.

The most obvious strategy to reduce convenience is to reduce the geographic availability of postsecondary education. Through the years, Colorado has made geographic access to postsecondary education opportunities--vocational-technical schools, community colleges, or four year colleges and universities--a priority. The availability of undergraduate instruction is especially widespread. The fact that today, no Colorado community with a

---

[3]Cost of capital, plus instruction for anticipated enrollment increase of 22%.

[4]Cost calculation: $2,225 per FTE x 4,423 = $9.8 million.

population of at least 4,000 is further than 17 miles from a vocational-technical school, community college, or undergraduate campus, is testimony to that commitment. In addition, nearly fifty state-funded off-campus degree programs are offered throughout Colorado. The state could establish population and enrollment guidelines that institutions must meet in order to receive state support. Areas of the state that do not meet these guidelines, but prefer greater access to postsecondary education, might wish to use local tax or other resources to expand access. Access could also be expanded through the use of telecommunication.

A) Constrain Convenience by Discontinuing State Funding for Off-Campus Instruction.

One strategy for constraining convenience would be to discontinue state funding for off-campus degree programs. Off-campus programs provide the opportunity for individuals living in rural Colorado to enroll part-time in complete degree programs offered in off-campus sites throughout the state. Discontinuing state support (and requiring students to pay the entire cost of their education) would undoubtedly reduce convenience for some students, and access for others, unable to travel to a campus to continue their education.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs:
$2 million (per year)[5]

B) Constrain Convenience by Closing Small Campus.

Another strategy for constraining convenience would be to close a small rural campus. This strategy would only provide minimal savings by eliminating some administrative expenditures, assuming that most students would enroll at another college at state expense.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs:
$1 million (per year)[6]

---

[5]Off-campus cost calculation: 1992-93 estimated state funded off-campus cost (567 FTE x $3,123 = $1.7 million.

[6]Campus closure estimates assume that savings would be limited to administrative expenditures only.

C) Constrain Convenience by Extending Campus Daily Use.

An additional strategy for constraining convenience would be to extend the daily and weekly use of current postsecondary facilities, that is, by offering classes earlier in the day and on weekends. This alternative would undoubtedly inconvenience some students who are either unable or prefer not to attend class during these times.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs: $136 million (by the year 2001)[7]

4. ALLOW THE QUALITY OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION TO DECLINE.

A fourth alternative to addressing the state's postsecondary education dilemma is intentionally to allow quality to decline. There are various ways that this could occur.

A) Allow Faculty Salaries to Diminish.

Perhaps the most obvious way to allow quality to decline would be to continue to let faculty salaries diminish in comparison to their peers. On average in 1990, Colorado faculty earned 7% less than faculty in other parts of the country (down 1% from 1989). Since most Colorado colleges and universities compete in a national market for faculty, Colorado could lose its most sought-after faculty to states in a position to offer more competitive salaries. This so called brain-drain has already begun to occur in this state. Over time, diminished faculty salaries will lead to a decline in quality.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs: $3 million (per year, by the year 2001)[8]

B) Allow Student/Faculty Contact Time to Decline.

Another way to allow quality to decline would be to reduce the amount of exposure that students have with faculty. Research indicates that one of the most effective elements of superior learning is the opportunity for students to have significant interactions with faculty both during and after class. One of the hallmarks of the Colorado postsecondary education system is the preservation of student/faculty contact at the community colleges and four-year undergraduate colleges. Reducing student/faculty contact by increasing class size or

---

[7]Extending campus use calculation assumes that the need for $136 million for additional facilities would be eliminated.

[8]Faculty salary cost calculation first assumes the addition of 1380 new full-time faculty to accommodate 22% increased enrollment, then total faculty salary reduction of 1%. Result = $3.4 million.

by relying more heavily upon part-time instructors who often spend little time with students outside the classroom would reduce the quality of education.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs: $15 million (per year by the year 2001)[9]

C) Allow Reductions in Student Support Services.

In addition, allowing reductions in student support services would undoubtedly reduce the quality of the learning experience. Services such as precollegiate programs, advising, job placement, library assistance, physical facilities, and computer access, all which ensure or enhance undergraduate learning, could be scaled back. To a certain extent, this strategy is already underway at many colleges because of recent fiscal constraints. The inherent danger in this approach is that institutions may already be perilously close to failing to provide the level of support services that today's students need and demand.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs: $3 million (by the year 2001)[10]

5. IMPROVE THE PRODUCTIVITY OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.

A fifth alternative for addressing the state's postsecondary education dilemma would be to improve productivity systemwide and at individual institutions to accomplish more with available resources.

A) Improve Systemwide Productivity.

One strategy for greater systemwide productivity would be to manage enrollment by directing new students to begin or complete their education at the lowest cost institutions. This alternative would undoubtedly severely challenge institutions already greatly pressured to meet increased student demand.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs: $7 million (by the year 2001)[11]

---

[9]Student/faculty contact calculation: Increase ratio by 5% (from approximately 18.0/1 to 19.0/1). Reduced need for new faculty by 63 and current faculty by 323. Average compensation= 40,200.

[10]Student support service calculation: Reduce per student expenditures by 1% in academic support, student services, and institutional support.

[11]Systemwide productivity calculation assumes a 10% savings of $300 per new FTE.

B) Improve Institutional Productivity.

One strategy for greater institutional productivity would be to increase simultaneously faculty productivity and implement the principles of Total Quality Management (TQM) on all campuses.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs:
$7 million (per year)[12]

C) Reprioritize State Objectives for Faculty.

Another strategy for increasing productivity would be to for the state to reprioritized the current objectives of faculty teaching, research, and community service.

6. CONSIDER NEW WAYS OF SUBSIDIZING POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION.

The final alternative presented in this paper to address the state's postsecondary education dilemma is to consider new strategies for state subsidy of postsecondary education. Today, the state provides approximately two-thirds of instructional support, while students (both undergraduate and graduate) pay one-third. Many alternative strategies could be considered, including the following.

A) Increase Tuition and Increase Student Financial Aid.

One strategy would be to reduce the broad subsidy that all resident students receive, regardless of their ability to pay. That is, increase tuition for all students and redirect tuition revenue from wealthier students to students who cannot afford tuition increases. Research shows that tuition increases, if offset by increases in financial aid for needy students, do not turn students away from college. Estimates show that increasing current resident tuition rates by 100% would generate approximately $170 million in new revenue. $94 million of this amount would be needed to assist low and middle income students. $76 million would be available for other uses.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Needs:
$76 million (per year)[13]

---

[12]Institutional productivity calculation assumes 1% productivity increase per year, on base budget of $700 million.

[13]Increased tuition calculation assumes a 100% tuition increase for all resident students.

B) Require the Primary Beneficiary of Postsecondary Education to Provide Primary Financial Support.

Another strategy for redirecting the current state subsidy, would be to adopt a "who benefits, who pays" approach. The state could, for example, determine that the state is the primary beneficiary of an educated citizenry, and therefore decide to place primary emphasis on state subsidy for undergraduate education. Under this strategy the state could continue to subsidize undergraduate education (at the two-thirds rate), and reduce the state subsidy for graduate education (to one-third). Reducing graduate subsidy would assert that while both the state and the individual benefits from each year of additional education received, the individual benefits of a post-baccalaureate degree exceed the "public" benefits.

Estimated Dollars Available to Meet Future Postsecondary Costs:
$25 million (per year)[14]

C) Other Alternatives for Subsidizing Postsecondary Education.

Other alternatives could include providing a guaranteed subsidy for all citizens to receive a specified number of credit hours at a state subsidized rate, or to subsidize different types and/or levels of education at varied rates, depending upon perceived value to the state. Examples could include limiting state subsidy for up to 120 credit hours, or for teachers, child care workers, engineers, full-time students, or degree seeking students.

CONCLUSION

The future presents a major challenge to the Colorado postsecondary education system. Change will occur. Enrollment will grow, demand will increase, as will calls for greater productivity, accountability, and efficiency--all as financial resources likely diminish.

The only question is whether change will occur by choice or by chance. The task before the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, through its Master Plan, is to develop a strategy that guides the state to the best possible future. Colorado postsecondary education can shape its own future. It will be a challenge, but it can and must be done.

---

[14]Reduction of subsidized graduate education calculation assumes 100% increase in resident graduate tuition.

The following additional CCHE Master Plan background papers are available by calling CCHE at (303)866-4039.

As A State, What Level Of Participation In Postsecondary Education Is Necessary To Assure A Just And Economically Successful Society?;

What Must Postsecondary Education Provide To Meet Individual Student Expectations?;

How Can Postsecondary Education Be More Effective, Particularly At The Undergraduate Level?;

How Can Postsecondary Education Be More Accountable To Colorado Citizens?;

Student Demand And Financial Projections For Colorado Higher Education, Fiscal Years 1993 Through 2002; and

Colorado Commission on Higher Education Implementation of House Bill 1187.